

## Affirmative Action Plan for the Recruitment, Hiring, Advancement, and Retention of Persons with Disabilities

To capture agencies' affirmative action plan for persons with disabilities (PWD) and persons with targeted disabilities (PWTD), EEOC regulations (29 C.F.R. § 1614.203(e)) and MD-715 require agencies to describe how their affirmative action plan will improve the recruitment, hiring, advancement, and retention of applicants and employees with disabilities.

### Section I: Efforts to Reach Regulatory Goals

*EEOC regulations (29 CFR §1614.203(d)(7)) require agencies to establish specific numerical goals for increasing the participation of persons with disabilities and persons with targeted disabilities in the federal government*

1. Using the goal of 12% as the benchmark, does your agency have a trigger involving PWD by grade level cluster in the permanent workforce? If "yes", describe the trigger(s) in the text box.

- a. Cluster GS-1 to GS-10 (PWD) Answer No
- b. Cluster GS-11 to SES (PWD) Answer No

GS-01 - GS-10 cluster: 23.74% PWD; GS-11 - SES 13.98% PWD - both are above the inclusion goal of 12%.

\*For GS employees, please use two clusters: GS-1 to GS-10 and GS-11 to SES, as set forth in 29 C.F.R. § 1614.203(d)(7). For all other pay plans, please use the approximate grade clusters that are above or below GS-11 Step 1 in the Washington, DC metropolitan region.

2. Using the goal of 2% as the benchmark, does your agency have a trigger involving PWTD by grade level cluster in the permanent workforce? If "yes", describe the trigger(s) in the text box.

- a. Cluster GS-1 to GS-10 (PWTD) Answer No
- b. Cluster GS-11 to SES (PWTD) Answer No

GS-01 - GS-10 cluster: 5.84% PWTD; GS-11 - SES 2.83% PWTD - both are above the inclusion goal of 2%.

| Grade Level Cluster(GS or Alternate Pay Planb) | Total | Reportable Disability |       | Targeted Disability |      |
|--|-------|-----------------------|-------|---------------------|------|
|  | #     | #                     | %     | #                   | %    |
| Numarical Goal                                 | --    | 12%                   |       | 2%                  |      |
| Grades GS-1 to GS-10                           | 257   | 61                    | 23.74 | 15                  | 5.84 |
| Grades GS-11 to SES                            | 6079  | 850                   | 13.98 | 172                 | 2.83 |

3. Describe how the agency has communicated the numerical goals to the hiring managers and/or recruiters.

DOE established annual hiring goals for People with Disabilities (PWD) and communicated these goals to senior level management throughout the Department. Quarterly assessments of progress toward these established hiring goals for PWD are communicated to Human Resources Business Partners (HRBPs) to inform hiring and recruitment consultations with their customers.

DOE is finalizing the 2021-2025 Strategic Human Capital Plan. The 2016-2020 Strategic Human Capital Plan set forth the Human Capital goals and strategies to support the mission and goals of the Department. In Section 6 Strategic Human Capital Outcomes, it states: The overarching outcome measure is the realization of Strategic Objective 12 from the DOE Strategic Plan for 2014-2018. (See: <https://www.energy.gov/sites/prod/files/2016/03/f30/DOE-Strategic-Human-Capital-Plan-2016-2020.pdf>, which is included as

a Supporting Document to this report.)

Strategic Objective 12 demonstrates the Agency’s commitment to: Attract, Manage, Train, and Retain the Best Federal Workforce to Meet Future Mission Needs. Specifically, it states: Efforts are underway to improve hiring quality and onboarding processes and outcomes, with a continued focus on promoting diversity and inclusion within the workforce. The following actions were taken in support of these strategic objectives:

- DOE established annual targeted hiring goals for people with disabilities and targeted disabilities that were distributed to DOE Elements and Human Resources Shared Service Centers (SSCs);
- HRBPs communicated the goals to Hiring Managers during hiring and recruitment consultations; and
- The information related to the Agency’s hiring goals was made available on the Office of the Chief Human Capital Officer (HC) intranet site (HCnet).

## Section II: Model Disability Program

Pursuant to 29 C.F.R. § 1614.203(d)(1), agencies must ensure sufficient staff, training and resources to recruit and hire persons with disabilities and persons with targeted disabilities, administer the reasonable accommodation program and special emphasis program, and oversee any other disability hiring and advancement program the agency has in place.

### A. PLAN TO PROVIDE SUFFICIENT & COMPETENT STAFFING FOR THE DISABILITY PROGRAM

1. Has the agency designated sufficient qualified personnel to implement its disability program during the reporting period? If “no”, describe the agency’s plan to improve the staffing for the upcoming year.

Answer Yes

2. Identify all staff responsible for implementing the agency's disability employment program by the office, staff employment status, and responsible official.

| Disability Program Task  | # of FTE Staff By Employment Status |           |                 | Responsible Official<br>(Name, Title, Office Email)                                      |
|--|-------------------------------------|-----------|-----------------|--|
|  | Full Time                           | Part Time | Collateral Duty |  |
| Processing reasonable accommodation requests from applicants and employees                     | 2                                   | 0         | 14              | Rita Hollins<br>Director<br>rita.hollins@hq.doe.gov                                      |
| Processing applications from PWD and PWTD  | 0                                   | 0         | 46              | Erin Moore<br>Chief Human Capital Officer  |
| Answering questions from the public about hiring authorities that take disability into account | 1                                   | 0         | 21              | Donna Friend<br>Disability/Veteran Employment Program Manager<br>donna.friend@hq.doe.gov |
| Section 508 Compliance   | 1                                   | 0         | 0               | Teddy Dyer<br>Information Technology Specialist<br>teddy.dyer@hq.doe.gov                 |
| Special Emphasis Program for PWD and PWTD  | 0                                   | 0         | 1               | Jaime Claudio<br>Chief<br>jaime.claudio@hq.doe.gov                                       |
| Architectural Barriers Act Compliance  | 1                                   | 0         | 0               | David Brown<br>Deputy Director, Technical Services                                       |

- 3.

Has the agency provided disability program staff with sufficient training to carry out their responsibilities during the reporting period? If “yes”, describe the training that disability program staff have received. If “no”, describe the training planned for the upcoming year.

Answer Yes

DOE has made training on hiring, retaining, and including People with Disabilities available through Learning Nucleus (LN), DOE’s online Learning Management System (LMS). This training, "A Roadmap to Success: Hiring, Retaining, and Including People with Disabilities," was originally developed by the Office of Personnel Management (OPM). DOE updated the course in 2020. This training is mandatory for Human Resources (HR) Professionals and Hiring Managers, and topics include:

1. Business advantages of having employees with disabilities in the workforce;
2. Government-wide hiring goals established in Section 501 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973;
3. Recruiting strategies and available excepted service hiring authorities;
4. Recruitment sources and Federal information websites for recruiting People with Disabilities; and
5. Interviewing tips, reasonable accommodations, and retention strategies.

**B. PLAN TO ENSURE SUFFICIENT FUNDING FOR THE DISABILITY PROGRAM**

Has the agency provided sufficient funding and other resources to successfully implement the disability program during the reporting period? If “no”, describe the agency’s plan to ensure all aspects of the disability program have sufficient funding and other resources.

Answer Yes

**Section III: Program Deficiencies In The Disability Program**

|  |   |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|
| <b>Brief Description of Program Deficiency</b> | C.2.b. Has the agency established disability reasonable accommodation procedures that comply with EEOC’s regulations and guidance? [see 29 CFR §1614.203(d)(3)] |  |  |
| <b>Objective</b>                               | To finalize and implement the Agency's new RA/PAS policy/procedures.  |  |  |
| <b>Target Date</b>                             | Sep 30, 2021  |  |  |
| <b>Completion Date</b>                         |   |  |  |
| <b>Planned Activities</b>                      | <u>Target Date</u>  | <u>Completion Date</u>   | <u>Planned Activity</u>  |
|  | Jul 16, 2018  |  | The Agency will finalize and implement its new RA/PAS policy/procedures.             |
|  | Oct 30, 2020  | December 1, 2021   | The Agency will submit the new RA/PAS policy/procedures to EEOC for review/approval. |
| <b>Accomplishments</b>                         | <u>Fiscal Year</u>  | <u>Accomplishment</u>  |  |
|  | 2022  | In January 2022, we received additional EEOC guidance and are working to finalize NLT April 2022.  |  |
|  | 2020  | HC had completed revisions to the reasonable accommodation (RA)/personal assistant services (PAS) procedures in FY '20, and the draft had been under review by other stakeholders. However, in late September 2020, HC established the new ELRPO to best support Departmental and organizational priorities in this critical area. This reorganization shifted responsibility for the development and implementation of the Department's updated RA/PAS procedures. The current RA/PAS procedures are available to DOE employees on HCNet and to DOE employees and the public on the Office of Civil Rights and Diversity webpage. |  |
|  | 2021  | ELRPO is building upon the foundational work that had been completed in this area and has identified new milestones that will result in the development and issuance of DOE’s updated RA/PAS policy/procedures by September 30, 2021.  |  |

|  |  |   |  |
|--|--|---|--|
| <b>Brief Description of Program Deficiency</b> | D.1.c. Does the agency conduct exit interviews or surveys that include questions on how the agency could improve the recruitment, hiring, inclusion, retention and advancement of individuals with disabilities? [see 29 CFR §1614.203(d)(1)(iii)(C)]                  |   |  |
| <b>Objective</b>                               | The EEO Office will continue to collaborate with HC to determine a best path forward on being able to incorporate a question into an exit survey related to improving the recruitment, hiring, inclusion, retention, and advancement of individuals with disabilities. |   |  |
| <b>Target Date</b>                             | Oct 15, 2020   |   |  |
| <b>Completion Date</b>                         |  |   |  |
| <b>Planned Activities</b>                      | <u>Target Date</u>   | <u>Completion Date</u>  | <u>Planned Activity</u>  |
|  | Sep 30, 2021   |   | OED and HC will continue to collaborate on potential methods for deploying the Exit Survey at Headquarters and other field site locations to expand the use of the Exit Survey by departing DOE employees. |
|  | Sep 30, 2021   | March 4, 2022   | The EEO Office Social Science Research Specialists will continue to collaborate with HC to strategize regarding data collection related to disability matters via DOE internal surveys and FEVS.           |
| <b>Accomplishments</b>                         | <u>Fiscal Year</u>   | <u>Accomplishment</u>   |  |
|  | 2022   | (1) The EEO Office on-boarded a second Social Science Research Specialist in Q2 of FY 2022, who will enable greater collaboration with HC on FEVS, the Exit Survey, and related HC employee life-cycle surveys. (2) The same three disability-related ASIs included in the FY 2021 FEVS will be retained along with five new items about harassment and retaliation at DOE in alignment with the draft DOE DEAI Strategic Plan. (3) A report of findings from the FY 2021 FEVS ASIs was developed by a team including the DOE FEVS Manager, both EEO Office Social Scientists, and the HQ Reasonable Accommodations Manager. The draft report is undergoing review and is expected to be released during FY 2022. |  |
|  | 2021   | The EEO Office Social Scientist completed a review of literature in March 2021 and prepared draft questions related to improving the recruitment, hiring, inclusion, retention, and advancement of individuals with disabilities. Three of these were accepted by the Deputy Secretary and included in the FY 2021 FEVS.  |  |
|  | 2021   | At this time, the HC Exit Survey is being piloted with the Bonneville Power Administration. However, OED plans to continue to collaborate with HC on potential methods for deploying the Exit Survey at Headquarters and other field site locations to expand the use of the Exit Survey by departing DOE employees.  |  |

## Section IV: Plan to Recruit and Hire Individuals with Disabilities

Pursuant to 29 C.F.R. §1614.203(d)(1)(i) and (ii), agencies must establish a plan to increase the recruitment and hiring of individuals with disabilities. The questions below are designed to identify outcomes of the agency’s recruitment program plan for PWD and PWTDD

### A. PLAN TO IDENTIFY JOB APPLICATIONS WITH DISABILITIES

1. Describe the programs and resources the agency uses to identify job applicants with disabilities, including individuals with targeted disabilities.

DOE leveraged a wide variety of recruitment sources and strategies to attract PWD for DOE job opportunities, including:

1. DOE quickly moved to promote DOE as an employer of choice through targeted virtual job fairs that offer convenient, safe, and low or no-cost options for individuals with disabilities. DOE promoted job opportunities, including vacancies in senior-level positions, through six recruitment and outreach events that specifically targeted individuals with disabilities, and 25 that targeted or included veterans with disabilities. These included: CAREERS & the disABLED Magazine’s physical and virtual Career Expos for

People with Disabilities, the Operation Warfighter Internship Fair, and Bender Virtual Job Fairs for individuals with disabilities. Virtual events are a popular recruitment strategy, expanding engagement with job seekers from across the Nation. Increased participant levels reaffirmed that using this form of engagement provides participants with a safe and free option for connecting with employers.

2. The 2021 DOE Virtual Disability Mentoring Day was hosted in collaboration with the American Association of People with Disabilities (AAPD) National effort. Participants included adults, college alumni, and students. Outreach included Gallaudet University, vocational rehabilitation centers, and military transition centers. Eight program offices offered participants an introduction to DOE mission areas and career and internship exploration. Over 20 individuals participated in the virtual event.

3. DOE continued to disseminate job opportunities widely through USAJOBS, the DOE jobs site, job boards, and various online sources (e.g., the Workforce Recruitment Program Database, U.S. Office of Personnel Management Shared Database, Handshake, and other college communication sites).

4. Opportunities provided through employment and internship programs in FY 2021: DOE onboarded 81 new hires through the Pathways Program, of which 18 (22.2%) were PWD (of which eight were PWTD), 13 were recent graduates, and five were interns who were afforded an opportunity to apply for future pipeline program opportunities.

2. Pursuant to 29 C.F.R. §1614.203(a)(3), describe the agency's use of hiring authorities that take disability into account (e.g., Schedule A) to recruit PWD and PWTD for positions in the permanent workforce

1. DOE uses Schedule A and veterans with disabilities hiring authorities to quickly fill positions prior to or in conjunction with job announcements. PWD and PWTD who wish to apply using Schedule A or the 30 Percent or More Disabled Veteran hiring authorities may do so by applying through a job announcement open for PWD or PWTD applicants, or they may contact representatives in the SSCs. Positions filled through Schedule A appointments frequently incorporate advancement opportunity to higher grade levels for employees with successful performance.

2. Schedule A applicants may be referred through a non-competitive Certificate of Eligibility or with other applicants from a competitive announcement. Sources for referrals of people with disabilities may include: a standing register, Agency files, unsolicited e-mails from people with disabilities, disability employment programs, such as Vocational Rehabilitation programs, networks, internships, and candidates identified through data mining or recruitment events.

3. The use of hiring authorities that take disabilities into account (Schedule A and veterans with disabilities of 30% or more) has increased over the last three years. For example, in FY 2019 there were 11 Schedule A and 32 hires of veterans with disabilities of 30% or more. In FY 2021 these numbers increased to hires of 16 Schedule A and 79 veterans with disabilities of 30% or more.

3. When individuals apply for a position under a hiring authority that takes disability into account (e.g., Schedule A), explain how the agency (1) determines if the individual is eligible for appointment under such authority; and, (2) forwards the individual's application to the relevant hiring officials with an explanation of how and when the individual may be appointed.

1. Eligibility is determined based on documentation, such as a Schedule A letter or letter from the Veterans Administration, that identifies the individual as a person with a disability who is eligible to be hired through Schedule A or veterans with disabilities authorities. Acceptable documentation for Schedule A is detailed in Title 5 C.F.R. Section 213-3102 (u)(3)(ii).

2. If an eligible applicant is deemed qualified for a vacant position, the applicant's resume is forwarded to the hiring official. The hiring official is provided with appropriate guidance on how to evaluate, interview, as well as select a desired applicant.

4. Has the agency provided training to all hiring managers on the use of hiring authorities that take disability into account (e.g., Schedule A)? If "yes", describe the type(s) of training and frequency. If "no", describe the agency's plan to provide this training.

Answer Yes

1. DOE provides supervisory training to new supervisors, which includes information on the use of Schedule A and hiring authorities for veterans with disabilities to quickly fill positions.
2. Hiring Managers are advised by their assigned HRBP, on a routine basis, regarding special hiring authorities which afford them direct access to persons with disabilities and reduce the time to hire when seeking to fill vacant positions quickly.
3. Hiring Managers and HR Professionals complete mandatory online training sessions through the LN. The courses include, but are not limited to, Veterans Employment Training, Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act (USERRA), and A Roadmap to Success: Hiring, Retaining and Including People with Disabilities. The following training was completed in FY 2021:
  - a. A total of 1,175 Hiring Managers and HR Professionals (55% of those assigned to the training) completed "A Roadmap to Success: Hiring, Retaining, and Including People with Disabilities." OPM developed the training specifically for Hiring Managers and HR Professionals. Topics covered include: the business advantages of having employees with disabilities in the workforce, Government-wide hiring goals established in Section 501 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, recruiting strategies and available excepted service hiring authorities, recruitment sources and Federal information websites for recruiting people with disabilities, interviewing tips, reasonable accommodations, accessibility, retention strategies, and tips to assist employees experiencing illness or injury in returning to work.
  - b. A total of 1,750 Hiring Managers and HR Professionals (76% of those assigned to the training) completed the "Veteran Employment Training." Specific topics covered include: the benefits of hiring veterans with disabilities, overview of Veteran's Preference, special hiring authorities, recruitment sources and Federal information resources, and recruitment strategies to increase hiring of veterans with disabilities.
  - c. A total of 1,706 Hiring Managers and HR Professionals (76% of those assigned to the training) completed the "Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act of 1994 (USERRA) Training." Federal USERRA law provides protections for return to duty of uniformed service members or recovery from a compensable injury. Course topics include: an overview of who is covered, rights under USERRA for individuals called to duty in the uniformed services, agency obligations, and responsibilities of the service member.

## B. PLAN TO ESTABLISH CONTACTS WITH DISABILITY EMPLOYMENT ORGANIZATIONS

Describe the agency's efforts to establish and maintain contacts with organizations that assist PWD, including PWTD, in securing and maintaining employment.

DOE maintained and continued to foster relationships with employment centers, job clubs, military bases, and colleges/universities during FY 2021. Outreach efforts focused on information sessions that offered an introduction to DOE, as well as potential career fields, apprenticeships, and internship opportunities.

Examples of DOE partnerships, which provided opportunities for people with disabilities through employment and internship programs in FY 2021, include:

- a. Savannah River (SR) Management and the HR Advisory Office maintained networking relationships with Fort Gordon Ga., Submarine Base Kings Bay Fleet and Family Support Center Ga., Luke Air Force Base Employer Panel, and the Work for Warriors Program.
- b. The Hanford Site partnered with the Columbia Basin Diversity and Inclusion Committee (CBDIC) to recruit and hire one Schedule A applicant. The CBDIC is a local committee in the Hanford commuting area that works to promote and sustain a diverse workforce by uniting the talents of veterans, military spouses, and individuals with disabilities with the employment needs of the Columbia Basin.
- c. DOE hosted the FY 2021 Virtual Disability Mentoring Day in collaboration with the American Association of People with Disabilities national effort. There were 20 participants in attendance at the virtual event. Participants included professionals, college alumni, and students. Outreach was to colleges and universities, such as Gallaudet University, vocational rehabilitation centers, and military transition centers. DOE had seven program offices participate in the event and provide an introduction to the Agency's mission areas, career tracks, and internship opportunities.

## C. PROGRESSION TOWARDS GOALS (RECRUITMENT AND HIRING)

1. Using the goals of 12% for PWD and 2% for PWTD as the benchmarks, do triggers exist for PWD and/or PWTD among the new hires in the permanent workforce? If “yes”, please describe the triggers below.

- a. New Hires for Permanent Workforce (PWD) Answer No
- b. New Hires for Permanent Workforce (PWTD) Answer No

Per Workforce Table B8: of the 645 permanent workforce new hires in FY 2021, PWD accounted for 87 new hires (13.49%) and PWTD accounted for 12 new hires (1.86%). No trigger is concluded for several reasons. First, there is measurement error associated with the SF256, which limits employees to selecting only one disability or serious health condition and on-going stigma associated with disability issues. Second, this is an example of statistical issues associated with analysis of comparatively small numbers. That is, had DOE hired one more PWTD, this percentage would have been 2.02%. Third, there were 92 permanent new hires (14.26%) in FY 2021 who did not identify their disability status.

| New Hires                 | Total<br>(#) | Reportable Disability   |                         | Targeted Disability     |                         |
|---------------------------|--------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
|                           |              | Permanent Workforce (%) | Temporary Workforce (%) | Permanent Workforce (%) | Temporary Workforce (%) |
| % of Total Applicants     | 0            |                         |                         |                         |                         |
| % of Qualified Applicants | 0            |                         |                         |                         |                         |
| % of New Hires            | 0            |                         |                         |                         |                         |

2. Using the qualified applicant pool as the benchmark, do triggers exist for PWD and/or PWTD among the new hires for any of the mission- critical occupations (MCO)? If “yes”, please describe the triggers below. Select “n/a” if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.

- a. New Hires for MCO (PWD) Answer No
- b. New Hires for MCO (PWTD) Answer No

Pilot analysis of USA Staffing applicant flow data (only available for Q4 of FY 2021) found that of the 450 permanent DOE new hires in FY 2021 into the largest 12 occupations (with 150 or more permanent employees), PWD accounted for 62 (13.8%) and PWTD accounted for 11 (2.4%) of new hires to permanent positions.

| New Hires to Mission-Critical Occupations | Total<br>(#) | Reportable Disability | Targetable Disability |
|---|--------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
|   |              | New Hires (%)         | New Hires (%)         |
| Numerical Goal                            | --           | 12%                   | 2%                    |

3. Using the relevant applicant pool as the benchmark, do triggers exist for PWD and/or PWTD among the qualified internal applicants for any of the mission-critical occupations (MCO)? If “yes”, please describe the triggers below. Select “n/a” if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.

- a. Qualified Applicants for MCO (PWD) Answer N/A
- b. Qualified Applicants for MCO (PWTD) Answer N/A

Data limitations for FY 2021 suggest caution in interpretation of findings of the USA Staffing applicant flow data. DOE adopted use of the USA Staffing hiring system on July 1, 2021, the start of Q4 for FY 2021. As such, these data provide only a limited view of FY 2021 hiring processes. For example, while DOE analyzed data associated with internal hiring (both supervisory and non-supervisory, separately) using USA Staffing, not all of the 12 largest DOE occupations had internal competitive promotions during

the fourth quarter. That said, of the 394 applications for internal competitive promotions included in the USA Staffing dataset for Q4 FY 2021, 5.6% were associated with PWD, which is below the 12% target.

4. Using the qualified applicant pool as the benchmark, do triggers exist for PWD and/or PWTD among employees promoted to any of the mission- critical occupations (MCO)? If “yes”, please describe the triggers below. Select “n/a” if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.

a. Promotions for MCO (PWD) Answer Yes

b. Promotions for MCO (PWTD) Answer Yes

Data limitations for FY 2021 suggest caution in interpretation of findings of the USA Staffing applicant flow data. DOE adopted the USA Staffing hiring system on July 1, 2021, the start of Q4 for FY 2021. As such, these data provide only a limited view of FY 2021 hiring processes. For example, while DOE analyzed data associated with internal hiring (both supervisory and non-supervisory, separately) using USA Staffing, not all of the 12 largest DOE occupations had internal competitive promotions during the fourth quarter.

As described, above (C.3), applications of PWD internal candidates for promotions within the 12 largest DOE occupations was lower than the 12% benchmark during Q4 of FY 2021. However, when analyzing data for the remainder of the application process, the following conclusions were reached:

(1) Qualification rates were higher for PWD (44.4%) than for all DOE applicants (38.8%) for non-supervisory internal promotions. Qualification rates were the same for PWD as for all DOE employees (about half of applicants were deemed qualified) for supervisory positions.

(2) For internal competitive promotions to supervisory positions, both qualified PWD applicants were referred and then selected (a 100% selection rate), which exceeded the rate for all DOE employees (25.0%).

(3) For internal promotions to non-supervisory positions, all qualified PWD but only 87.7% of all qualified DOE employees were referred. Among those referred, 17.0% of all DOE employees were selected but only 12.5% of PWD were selected.

(4) Analysis of DOE 2019 FEVS data (which includes all of DOE, not just the components included in this report) shows that 37.8% of respondents who said they had a disability, but only 28.7% of all DOE respondents, had negative assessments of their opportunity to get a better job at DOE (note: this item was removed for the FY 2020 and FY 2021 FEVS administrations by OPM):

Q67. Satisfaction with opportunity to get a better job in organization

All DOE: Positive: 43.5%; Negative: 28.7%

DOE PWD: Positive: 37.2%; Negative: 37.8%

These data and a recent review article by Bonaccio et al (2020) indicates a need to dedicate particular attention to advancement processes.

(Reference: Bonaccio, Silvia, Catherine E Connelly, Ian R Gellatly, Arif Jetha, and Kathleen A Martin Ginis. 2020. "The Participation of People with Disabilities in the Workplace Across the Employment Cycle: Employer Concerns and Research Evidence." *Journal of Business Psychology* 35 (2): 135-158. doi:10.1007/s10869-018-9602-5.)

## Section V: Plan to Ensure Advancement Opportunities for Employees with Disabilities

Pursuant to 29 C.F.R. §1614.203(d)(1)(iii), agencies are required to provide sufficient advancement opportunities for employees with disabilities. Such activities might include specialized training and mentoring programs, career development opportunities, awards programs, promotions, and similar programs that address advancement. In this section, agencies should identify, and provide data on programs designed to ensure advancement opportunities for employees with disabilities.

### A. ADVANCEMENT PROGRAM PLAN

Describe the agency’s plan to ensure PWD, including PWTD, have sufficient opportunities for advancement.

1. Employees are required to establish an Individual Development Plan in consultation with their supervisor and are encouraged to apply for opportunities to broaden their skills and competencies for career progression. Federal employees at DOE can use competency assessments to identify competency-based training and development opportunities that could help them achieve sustained career growth. Several Program Offices assess the training and development needs of their workforce by conducting a training needs assessment.

2. Learning and development opportunities are promoted through LN, DOE-wide announcements, internal websites, program office internal communication channels, and through consultations provided to employees by managers, as well as organizational leaders. DOE has also taken steps to promote career development and training for veterans and people with disabilities by sharing information virtually through employee resource groups, Training Administrators, email distribution lists, monitors, and posters placed in prominent places.

LN provides every Federal employee access to LN employee development tools and resources, including an expansive course catalog, competency assessment, and mentoring modules to support employee development goals.

3. The LN Mentoring Module aids in establishing mentoring relationships. There are 25 mentor/mentee pairings and one group pairing. Of the 44 mentors, seven (15.9%) have a disability. Of the 127 mentees, nine are PWD (7.1%). In addition to LN, Program Offices within DOE offer mentoring opportunities. For example, the Office of Legacy Management (LM) utilizes the LN mentoring module via their teaming structure, which fosters a culture of continual mentorship of all fellow team members. Additionally, LM supervisors and senior staff are charged with mentoring members of their teams.

4. Internal career advancement and detail opportunities are communicated broadly through Program Office email networks and the intranet portal to ensure employees are aware of opportunities. For example, in FY 2021 Expressions of Interest (EOI) Announcements offered employees the opportunity to apply for details, temporary promotions, and reassignments. All employees had access to EOI announcements through DOE's intranet and weekly EOI updates through email.

5. Information sessions offered by Program Offices assist the workforce in achieving their career aspirations. For example, the Savannah River Operations Office (SR), along with the support and implementation of the SR Senior Management Team, held several Professional Growth Seminars to discuss career paths, advancement opportunities, and how to apply and interview for vacant positions within DOE and other Federal agencies. The panel consists of at least one Senior Executive, Subject Matter Experts, and the DOE-SR team that provide all employees with the resources and guidance to manage their career goals. This recruitment strategy provides an opportunity for employees with disabilities to compete for development and leadership assignments.

6. Some Program Offices conducted workforce analysis to identify potential barriers in the advancement of employees with disabilities. EEO/Diversity Managers play a key role in identifying and eliminating barriers. For example, the Office of Science conducts a workforce analysis to understand if barriers to advancement exist for employees with disabilities.

7. In FY 2021, DOE provided career and leadership development opportunities for employees through a suite of different programs, rotational opportunities, detail appointments, and Agency and corporate sponsored courses. In addition, DOE recently launched the ExecOnline pilot training program to provide employees unique course offerings in three tracks: Managing and Working in a Hybrid and Virtual Environment, Critical Projects, and Leadership Development. Many Program Offices also sponsored employees or offered technical training through the National Training Center or outside vendors. For example, the Office of Fossil Energy and Carbon Management (FECM) offered employees a chance to compete for training funds to obtain an academic degree or participate in a leadership and career development program.

8. A DOE ERG is currently in the development phase, to address issues for PWD and will focus, in part, on advancement concerns.

## **B. CAREER DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITES**

1. Please describe the career development opportunities that the agency provides to its employees.

1. In FY 2021, DOE provided career and leadership development opportunities for employees through a suite of different programs, rotational opportunities, detail appointments, corporately sponsored courses, and the LN. Additionally, many Program Offices sponsor employees or offer technical training through the National Training Center or outside vendors. For example, the FECM offers a competitive Leadership and Career Development Program for employees interested in external training, such as the Federal

Executive Institute and an Academic Degree Program for employees to complete or obtain a job-related degree. FECM centralized approvals for these programs to ensure a fair and consistent process.

- a. Of the 138 OPM Leadership 360-degree program participants, 12.3% were PWD, and 7.2% were veterans with a disability. Of the veterans with a disability, 6.5% were veterans with a disability of 30% or more.
- b. Of the 49 employees who participated in the DOE Leadership Development Program, 4.1% were PWD. Additionally, 24.5% were veterans with disabilities, of which, 18.4% were veterans with a disability of 30% or more.
- c. Of the 994 instances of training through the Professional Skills Program, 20.9% were PWD (3.5% PWTD). In addition, 14.4% were veterans with disabilities, of which, 11.4% were veterans with a disability of 30% or more.
- d. Of the 808 employees who participated in the Supervisory Training: 20.9% were PWD; 2.5% PWTD; and 8.5% were veterans with disabilities, of which 6.8% were veterans with disabilities of 30% or more.

2. Program Offices offered information sessions to help employees, including veterans and veterans with disabilities, achieve their career aspirations. For example, the SR HR Advisory Office, along with the support of the SR senior management team, held several Professional Growth Seminars to discuss career paths, advancement opportunities, and how to apply and interview for vacant positions within DOE and other Federal agencies.

2. In the table below, please provide the data for career development opportunities that require competition and/or supervisory recommendation/ approval to participate.

| Career Development Opportunities  | Total Participants |               | PWD            |               | PWTD           |               |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|
|                                   | Applicants (#)     | Selectees (#) | Applicants (%) | Selectees (%) | Applicants (%) | Selectees (%) |
| Internship Programs               | 0                  | 0             | 0.0            | 0.0           | 0.0            | 0.0           |
| Fellowship Programs               | 41                 | 41            | 2.4            | 2.4           | 0.0            | 0.0           |
| Training Programs                 | 341                | 341           | 20.8           | 20.8          | 2.6            | 2.6           |
| Detail Programs                   | 9                  | 9             | 22.2           | 22.2          | 0.0            | 0.0           |
| Mentoring Programs                | 127                | 127           | 12.6           | 12.6          | 1.6            | 1.6           |
| Coaching Programs                 | 138                | 138           | 12.3           | 12.3          | 2.9            | 2.9           |
| Other Career Development Programs | 3215               | 17            | 19.6           | 19.6          | 13.7           | 13.7          |

3. Do triggers exist for PWD among the applicants and/or selectees for any of the career development programs? (The appropriate benchmarks are the relevant applicant pool for the applicants and the applicant pool for selectees.) If “yes”, describe the trigger(s) in the text box. Select “n/a” if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.

a. Applicants (PWD) Answer Yes

b. Selections (PWD) Answer No

Although there is no evidence to suggest disparities in selection once an individual applies for a career development opportunity, using the 12% goal for PWD as a benchmark for the applicant pool, only one trigger is present: Fellowship Programs, where PWD account for only 2.4% of applicants.

This necessitates additional organizational research, especially in light of the FEVS results. Analysis of DOE 2019 FEVS data (which includes all of DOE, not just the components included in this report) shows that 37.8% of respondents who said they had a disability, but only 28.7% of all DOE respondents had negative assessments of their opportunity to get a better job at DOE (note: this item was removed from the FY 2020 and FY 2021 FEVS administrations by OPM): Q67. Satisfaction with opportunity to get a better job in organization:

All DOE Positive: 43.5% Negative: 28.7%

Individuals with a disability Positive: 37.2% Negative: 37.8%

4. Do triggers exist for PWTD among the applicants and/or selectees for any of the career development programs? (The appropriate benchmarks are the relevant applicant pool for the applicants and the applicant pool for selectees.) If “yes”, describe the trigger(s) in the text box. Select “n/a” if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.

a. Applicants (PWTD) Answer Yes

b. Selections (PWTD) Answer No

Although there is no evidence to suggest disparities in selection once an individual applies for a career development opportunity, using the 2% goal for PWTD as a benchmark for the applicant pool, the following triggers are present:  
 (1) Fellowship and Detail Programs with 0.0% PWTD applicants; and,  
 (2) Mentoring with 1.6% PWTD applicants.  
 These rates of participation by PWTD also necessitate additional organizational research, especially in light of the FEVS results, cited earlier.

**C. AWARDS**

1. Using the inclusion rate as the benchmark, does your agency have a trigger involving PWD and/or PWTD for any level of the time-off awards, bonuses, or other incentives? If “yes”, please describe the trigger(s) in the text box.

a. Awards, Bonuses, & Incentives (PWD) Answer No

b. Awards, Bonuses, & Incentives (PWTD) Answer No

There were no substantial systematic differences in the inclusion rate for cash awards for PWD or PWTD as compared to the overall DOE rates. However, PWD (34.0%) and PWTD (39.0%) are more likely than DOE employees (29.0%), overall to be awarded time-off awards. (See Workforce Analysis Report: MD-715 Supporting Document for more details.)

| Time-Off Awards                              | Total (#) | Reportable Disability % | Without Reportable Disability % | Targeted Disability % | Without Targeted Disability % |
|--|-----------|-------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------|
| Time-Off Awards 1 - 10 hours: Awards Given   | 192       | 2.99                    | 2.90                            | 4.28                  | 2.67                          |
| Time-Off Awards 1 - 10 Hours: Total Hours    | 1439      | 25.08                   | 21.24                           | 37.43                 | 22.00                         |
| Time-Off Awards 1 - 10 Hours: Average Hours  | 7.49      | 0.90                    | 0.14                            | 4.68                  | -0.05                         |
| Time-Off Awards 11 - 20 hours: Awards Given  | 208       | 4.27                    | 2.96                            | 4.28                  | 4.27                          |
| Time-Off Awards 11 - 20 Hours: Total Hours   | 3650      | 76.84                   | 51.67                           | 78.61                 | 76.40                         |
| Time-Off Awards 11 - 20 Hours: Average Hours | 17.55     | 1.92                    | 0.33                            | 9.83                  | -0.05                         |
| Time-Off Awards 21 - 30 hours: Awards Given  | 336       | 8.86                    | 4.44                            | 12.30                 | 8.00                          |
| Time-Off Awards 21 - 30 Hours: Total Hours   | 9359      | 251.65                  | 122.69                          | 348.13                | 227.60                        |
| Time-Off Awards 21 - 30 Hours: Average Hours | 27.85     | 3.03                    | 0.52                            | 15.13                 | 0.01                          |
| Time-Off Awards 31 - 40 hours: Awards Given  | 572       | 10.03                   | 8.42                            | 10.70                 | 9.87                          |
| Time-Off Awards 31 - 40 Hours: Total Hours   | 22648     | 395.09                  | 333.46                          | 424.60                | 387.73                        |

| Time-Off Awards                                 | Total (#) | Reportable Disability % | Without Reportable Disability % | Targeted Disability % | Without Targeted Disability % |
|---|-----------|-------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------|
| Time-Off Awards 31 - 40 Hours: Average Hours    | 39.59     | 4.20                    | 0.75                            | 21.23                 | -0.04                         |
| Time-Off Awards 41 or more Hours: Awards Given  | 613       | 7.79                    | 9.77                            | 7.49                  | 7.87                          |
| Time-Off Awards 41 or more Hours: Total Hours   | 34472     | 432.66                  | 549.82                          | 431.02                | 433.07                        |
| Time-Off Awards 41 or more Hours: Average Hours | 56.23     | 5.93                    | 1.06                            | 30.79                 | -0.27                         |

| Cash Awards                                  | Total (#) | Reportable Disability % | Without Reportable Disability % | Targeted Disability % | Without Targeted Disability % |
|--|-----------|-------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------|
| Cash Awards: \$501 - \$999: Awards Given     | 179       | 3.74                    | 2.50                            | 4.81                  | 3.47                          |
| Cash Awards: \$501 - \$999: Total Amount     | 132926    | 2764.67                 | 1858.29                         | 3349.73               | 2618.80                       |
| Cash Awards: \$501 - \$999: Average Amount   | 742.6     | 78.99                   | 13.97                           | 372.19                | 5.89                          |
| Cash Awards: \$1000 - \$1999: Awards Given   | 617       | 10.89                   | 8.94                            | 13.90                 | 10.13                         |
| Cash Awards: \$1000 - \$1999: Total Amount   | 905162    | 15877.27                | 13071.76                        | 20390.37              | 14752.00                      |
| Cash Awards: \$1000 - \$1999: Average Amount | 1467.04   | 155.66                  | 27.52                           | 784.25                | -1.07                         |
| Cash Awards: \$2000 - \$2999: Awards Given   | 650       | 9.71                    | 9.83                            | 10.16                 | 9.60                          |
| Cash Awards: \$2000 - \$2999: Total Amount   | 1623338   | 24277.59                | 24540.24                        | 23972.73              | 24353.60                      |
| Cash Awards: \$2000 - \$2999: Average Amount | 2497.44   | 266.79                  | 47.01                           | 1261.72               | 18.72                         |
| Cash Awards: \$3000 - \$3999: Awards Given   | 713       | 9.28                    | 11.24                           | 9.63                  | 9.20                          |
| Cash Awards: \$3000 - \$3999: Total Amount   | 2495710   | 32072.04                | 39462.23                        | 34642.25              | 31431.20                      |
| Cash Awards: \$3000 - \$3999: Average Amount | 3500.29   | 368.64                  | 66.10                           | 1924.57               | -19.30                        |
| Cash Awards: \$4000 - \$4999: Awards Given   | 652       | 9.39                    | 10.34                           | 9.09                  | 9.47                          |
| Cash Awards: \$4000 - \$4999: Total Amount   | 2944038   | 42288.26                | 46695.90                        | 41225.13              | 42553.33                      |
| Cash Awards: \$4000 - \$4999: Average Amount | 4515.4    | 480.55                  | 85.06                           | 2425.01               | -4.27                         |
| Cash Awards: \$5000 or more: Awards Given    | 1346      | 16.01                   | 21.67                           | 10.70                 | 17.33                         |
| Cash Awards: \$5000 or more: Total Amount    | 8747884   | 106659.98               | 140241.14                       | 73191.98              | 115004.67                     |
| Cash Awards: \$5000 or more: Average Amount  | 6499.17   | 711.07                  | 121.84                          | 3659.60               | -24.10                        |

2. Using the inclusion rate as the benchmark, does your agency have a trigger involving PWD and/or PWTB for quality step increases or performance-based pay increases? If “yes”, please describe the trigger(s) in the text box.

a. Pay Increases (PWD) Answer Yes

b. Pay Increases (PWTB) Answer Yes

There is mixed evidence for triggers, since QSIs (irregular cycle ratings-based pay increases) are close to equity but regular-cycle

pay increases for PWD and PWTD are below the rates for DOE, overall. Comparing the rates at which QSIs were awarded within each disability status category (PWD and PWTD) to the DOE overall rate:

- (1) 6.8% of DOE employees elected a QSI, while 5.2% of PWD and 7.0% of PWTD did so.
- (2) Regular-cycle pay increases were awarded to 4.1% of DOE employees, with 3.2% of PWD and 1.6% of PWTD receiving regular-cycle pay increases.

However, as noted in the Workforce Analysis Report: MD-715 Supporting Document, additional research is necessary to understand whether there are long-term gaps in the timeliness with which PWD and PWTD receive regular-cycle pay increases as compared to all DOE employees.

DOE analyzed FEVS 2021 data associated with employee satisfaction with recognition for doing a good job (see Workforce Analysis Report: MD-715 Supporting Document) and found: PWD were less likely (60.8% ) to be satisfied than DOE employees overall (69.2%) with recognition, and conversely, expressed more negative assessments of recognition (PWD: 21.7% negative vs. all DOE employees 15.1% negative).

| Other Awards                                  | Total (#) | Reportable Disability % | Without Reportable Disability % | Targeted Disability % | Without Targeted Disability % |
|---|-----------|-------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------|
| Total Performance Based Pay Increases Awarded | 0         | 0.00                    | 0.00                            | 0.00                  | 0.00                          |

3. If the agency has other types of employee recognition programs, are PWD and/or PWTD recognized disproportionately less than employees without disabilities? (The appropriate benchmark is the inclusion rate.) If “yes”, describe the employee recognition program and relevant data in the text box.

- a. Other Types of Recognition (PWD) Answer Yes
- b. Other Types of Recognition (PWTD) Answer Yes

As shown in Workforce Analysis Report: MD-715 Supporting Document, PWD were slightly less likely (39.6%) than DOE employees overall (42.1%) to receive non-ratings-based cash awards in FY2021. The rate for PWTD (40.6%) is similar to all DOE employees. The amount of these cash awards differed when compared to the DOE overall median value of \$800. The median awards to PWD were \$600, while median awards to PWTD were \$500.

**D. PROMOTIONS**

1. Does your agency have a trigger involving PWD among the qualified internal applicants and/or selectees for promotions to the senior grade levels? (The appropriate benchmarks are the relevant applicant pool for qualified internal applicants and the qualified applicant pool for selectees.) For non-GS pay plans, please use the approximate senior grade levels. If “yes”, describe the trigger(s) in the text box. Select “n/a” if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.

- a. SES
  - i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD) Answer N/A
  - ii. Internal Selections (PWD) Answer N/A
- b. Grade GS-15
  - i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD) Answer N/A
  - ii. Internal Selections (PWD) Answer N/A
- c. Grade GS-14
  - i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD) Answer N/A
  - ii. Internal Selections (PWD) Answer N/A

d. Grade GS-13

- i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD) Answer N/A
- ii. Internal Selections (PWD) Answer N/A

Insufficient data to assess, as there were limited applicant flow data available from USA Staffing in FY 2021 (i.e., 4th quarter only). DOE will have full fiscal year data in FY 2022 for this assessment.

2. Does your agency have a trigger involving PWTB among the qualified internal applicants and/or selectees for promotions to the senior grade levels? (The appropriate benchmarks are the relevant applicant pool for qualified internal applicants and the qualified applicant pool for selectees.) For non-GS pay plans, please use the approximate senior grade levels. If “yes”, describe the trigger(s) in the text box. Select “n/a” if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.

a. SES

- i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTB) Answer N/A
- ii. Internal Selections (PWTB) Answer N/A

b. Grade GS-15

- i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTB) Answer N/A
- ii. Internal Selections (PWTB) Answer N/A

c. Grade GS-14

- i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTB) Answer N/A
- ii. Internal Selections (PWTB) Answer N/A

d. Grade GS-13

- i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTB) Answer N/A
- ii. Internal Selections (PWTB) Answer N/A

Insufficient data to assess, as there were limited applicant flow data available from USA Staffing in FY 2021 (i.e., 4th quarter only). DOE will have full fiscal year data in FY 2022 for this assessment.

3. Using the qualified applicant pool as the benchmark, does your agency have a trigger involving PWD among the new hires to the senior grade levels? For non-GS pay plans, please use the approximate senior grade levels. If “yes”, describe the trigger(s) in the text box. Select “n/a” if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.

- a. New Hires to SES (PWD) Answer N/A
- b. New Hires to GS-15 (PWD) Answer N/A
- c. New Hires to GS-14 (PWD) Answer N/A
- d. New Hires to GS-13 (PWD) Answer N/A

Insufficient data to assess, as there were limited applicant flow data available from USA Staffing in FY 2021 (i.e., 4th quarter only). DOE will have full fiscal year data in FY 2022 for this assessment.

4. Using the qualified applicant pool as the benchmark, does your agency have a trigger involving PWTD among the new hires to the senior grade levels? For non-GS pay plans, please use the approximate senior grade levels. If “yes”, describe the trigger(s) in the text box. Select “n/a” if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.

- a. New Hires to SES (PWTD) Answer N/A
- b. New Hires to GS-15 (PWTD) Answer N/A
- c. New Hires to GS-14 (PWTD) Answer N/A
- d. New Hires to GS-13 (PWTD) Answer N/A

Insufficient data to assess, as there were limited applicant flow data available from USA Staffing in FY 2021 (i.e., 4th quarter only). DOE will have full fiscal year data in FY 2022 for this assessment.

5. Does your agency have a trigger involving PWD among the qualified internal applicants and/or selectees for promotions to supervisory positions? (The appropriate benchmarks are the relevant applicant pool for qualified internal applicants and the qualified applicant pool for selectees.) If “yes”, describe the trigger(s) in the text box. Select “n/a” if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.

- a. Executives
  - i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD) Answer N/A
  - ii. Internal Selections (PWD) Answer N/A
- b. Managers
  - i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD) Answer N/A
  - ii. Internal Selections (PWD) Answer N/A
- c. Supervisors
  - i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD) Answer N/A
  - ii. Internal Selections (PWD) Answer N/A

Insufficient data to assess, as there were limited applicant flow data available from USA Staffing in FY 2021 (i.e., 4th quarter only). DOE will have full fiscal year data in FY 2022 for this assessment.

6. Does your agency have a trigger involving PWTD among the qualified internal applicants and/or selectees for promotions to supervisory positions? (The appropriate benchmarks are the relevant applicant pool for qualified internal applicants and the qualified applicant pool for selectees.) If “yes”, describe the trigger(s) in the text box. Select “n/a” if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.

- a. Executives
  - i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD) Answer N/A
  - ii. Internal Selections (PWTD) Answer N/A
- b. Managers
  - i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD) Answer N/A
  - ii. Internal Selections (PWTD) Answer N/A

c. Supervisors

- i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD) Answer N/A
- ii. Internal Selections (PWTD) Answer N/A

Insufficient data to assess, as there were limited applicant flow data available from USA Staffing in FY 2021 (i.e., 4th quarter only). DOE will have full fiscal year data in FY 2022 for this assessment.

7. Using the qualified applicant pool as the benchmark, does your agency have a trigger involving PWD among the selectees for new hires to supervisory positions? If “yes”, describe the trigger(s) in the text box. Select “n/a” if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.

- a. New Hires for Executives (PWD) Answer N/A
- b. New Hires for Managers (PWD) Answer N/A
- c. New Hires for Supervisors (PWD) Answer N/A

Insufficient data to assess, as there were limited applicant flow data available from USA Staffing in FY 2021 (i.e., 4th quarter only). DOE will have full fiscal year data in FY 2022 for this assessment.

8. Using the qualified applicant pool as the benchmark, does your agency have a trigger involving PWTD among the selectees for new hires to supervisory positions? If “yes”, describe the trigger(s) in the text box. Select “n/a” if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.

- a. New Hires for Executives (PWTD) Answer N/A
- b. New Hires for Managers (PWTD) Answer N/A
- c. New Hires for Supervisors (PWTD) Answer N/A

Insufficient data to assess, as there were limited applicant flow data available from USA Staffing in FY 2021 (i.e., 4th quarter only). DOE will have full fiscal year data in FY 2022 for this assessment.

## Section VI: Plan to Improve Retention of Persons with Disabilities

To be model employer for persons with disabilities, agencies must have policies and programs in place to retain employees with disabilities. In this section, agencies should: (1) analyze workforce separation data to identify barriers retaining employees with disabilities; (2) describe efforts to ensure accessibility of technology and facilities; and (3) provide information on the reasonable accommodation program and workplace assistance services.

### A. VOLUNTARY AND INVOLUNTARY SEPARATIONS

1. In this reporting period, did the agency convert all eligible Schedule A employees with a disability into the competitive service after two years of satisfactory service (5 C.F.R. § 213.3102(u)(6)(i))? If “no”, please explain why the agency did not convert all eligible Schedule A employees.

Answer No

There were 11 Schedule A employees hired in FY 2019. Of these, three were converted to Appointment type 15, Career Conditional, Permanent. The other eight were not converted but were still on board at DOE in FY 2021.

2. Using the inclusion rate as the benchmark, did the percentage of PWD among voluntary and involuntary separations exceed that of persons without disabilities? If “yes”, describe the trigger below.

- a. Voluntary Separations (PWD) Answer No
- b. Involuntary Separations (PWD) Answer No

All DOE: Of 542 total separations 2.0% were involuntary.  
 PWD: Of 80 total separations, 3.0% were involuntary.  
 Not a meaningfully different gap.

| Separations                             | Total # | Reportable Disabilities % | Without Reportable Disabilities % |
|---|---------|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Permanent Workforce: Reduction in Force | 0       | 0.00                      | 0.00                              |
| Permanent Workforce: Removal            | 12      | 0.21                      | 0.16                              |
| Permanent Workforce: Resignation        | 120     | 1.23                      | 1.78                              |
| Permanent Workforce: Retirement         | 268     | 4.94                      | 3.62                              |
| Permanent Workforce: Other Separations  | 142     | 1.85                      | 2.04                              |
| Permanent Workforce: Total Separations  | 542     | 8.23                      | 7.60                              |

3. Using the inclusion rate as the benchmark, did the percentage of PWTD among voluntary and involuntary separations exceed that of persons without targeted disabilities? If “yes”, describe the trigger below.

- a. Voluntary Separations (PWTD) Answer No
- b. Involuntary Separations (PWTD) Answer No

All DOE: Of 542 total separations 2.0% were involuntary.  
 PWD: Of 17 total separations, 0% were involuntary.  
 Not a meaningfully different gap.

| Separations                             | Total # | Targeted Disabilities % | Without Targeted Disabilities % |
|---|---------|-------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Permanent Workforce: Reduction in Force | 0       | 0.00                    | 0.00                            |
| Permanent Workforce: Removal            | 12      | 0.00                    | 0.17                            |
| Permanent Workforce: Resignation        | 120     | 1.03                    | 1.72                            |
| Permanent Workforce: Retirement         | 268     | 4.12                    | 3.79                            |
| Permanent Workforce: Other Separations  | 142     | 3.61                    | 1.97                            |
| Permanent Workforce: Total Separations  | 542     | 8.76                    | 7.65                            |

4. If a trigger exists involving the separation rate of PWD and/or PWTD, please explain why they left the agency using exit interview results and other data sources.

N/A

**B. ACCESSIBILITY OF TECHNOLOGY AND FACILITIES**

Pursuant to 29 CFR §1614.203(d)(4), federal agencies are required to inform applicants and employees of their rights under Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. § 794(b), concerning the accessibility of agency technology, and the Architectural Barriers Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. § 4151-4157), concerning the accessibility of agency facilities. In addition, agencies are required to inform individuals where to file complaints if other agencies are responsible for a violation.

- 1. Please provide the internet address on the agency’s public website for its notice explaining employees’ and applicants’ rights under Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act, including a description of how to file a complaint.

<https://www.energy.gov/cio/department-energy-doe-and-section-508> DOE has issued a notice explaining employee and applicant

rights under Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act. A description of how to file a complaint is also on this public website.

- Please provide the internet address on the agency's public website for its notice explaining employees' and applicants' rights under the Architectural Barriers Act, including a description of how to file a complaint.

GSA owns the buildings that DOE occupies. The following website provides relevant information: <https://www.gsa.gov/real-estate/design-construction/accessible-facility-design>.

- Describe any programs, policies, or practices that the agency has undertaken, or plans on undertaking over the next fiscal year, designed to improve accessibility of agency facilities and/or technology.

In FY 2021, the Agency did not implement any projects to improve accessibility of facilities during the reporting period. The DOE Headquarters building is fully ADAAA compliant.

### C. REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION PROGRAM

Pursuant to 29 C.F.R. § 1614.203(d)(3), agencies must adopt, post on their public website, and make available to all job applicants and employees, reasonable accommodation procedures.

- Please provide the average time frame for processing initial requests for reasonable accommodations during the reporting period. (Please do not include previously approved requests with repetitive accommodations, such as interpreting services.)

The approximate number of days for processing an initial request for reasonable accommodation across the DOE complex was 30 days during the reporting period.

- Describe the effectiveness of the policies, procedures, or practices to implement the agency's reasonable accommodation program. Some examples of an effective program include timely processing requests, timely providing approved accommodations, conducting training for managers and supervisors, and monitoring accommodation requests for trends.

During FY 2021, the desk reference for reasonable accommodation/personal assistance services procedures served as an informative tool for those requesting reasonable accommodations. The desk reference was also helpful for managers, supervisors, and the Local Reasonable Accommodation Coordinators.

- HC provides oversight of Local Reasonable Accommodation Coordinators (LRACs) across the Department who work with employees, managers, and supervisors. DOE leverages the Department of Defense's Computer/Electronic Accommodations Program to provide RAs for qualified applicants with disabilities, including veterans with disabilities.
- During FY 2021, the Corporate Reasonable Accommodation Program Manager, in the Office of Economic Impact and Diversity, processed requests for reconsideration and provided a series of trainings for LRACs and other stakeholders.
- Information about the DOE Headquarters RA/PAS Program is available on [energy.gov](http://energy.gov) at: [www.energy.gov/hc/services/benefits/wellness-program/headquarters-accommodation-program](http://www.energy.gov/hc/services/benefits/wellness-program/headquarters-accommodation-program). In addition, the Department takes steps to educate staff about RAs and compliance with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. For example, the Department's Section 508 Coordinator holds training sessions to educate DOE employees on compliance requirements and instructions for creating accessible content for websites, documents, and videos.
- In 2021, DOE announced new RA/PAS policies and procedures through Policy Memorandum (PM) #100 and located responsibility for implementing these in the Office of the Chief Human Capital Officer (CHCO). The Equal Employment Opportunity Assessment and Compliance Division (EEO-ACD, formerly the Equity and Diversity Division) in the DOE Office of Civil Rights (OCR) developed three Agency Specific Items (ASIs) that were added to the FY 2021 FEVS to determine a baseline for DOE employees knowledge of the RA/PAS policies and procedures and awareness of unfair treatment of PWD. EEO-ACD analysis of these ASIs in February 2022 found:

- Most DOE employees know how to request an RA/PAS (72%) and to report unfair treatment of a PWD (69%) at DOE.
- However, 28% were not aware of how to request an RA/PAS, and 31% did not know how to report an instance of unfair treatment of a PWD at DOE.

These ASI findings will appear in a joint HC/EEO-ACD report with actions to address these knowledge gaps under development in FY 2022.

**D. PERSONAL ASSISTANCE SERVICES ALLOWING EMPLOYEES TO PARTICIPATE IN THE WORKPLACE**

*Pursuant to 29 CFR §1614.203(d)(5), federal agencies, as an aspect of affirmative action, are required to provide personal assistance services (PAS) to employees who need them because of a targeted disability, unless doing so would impose an undue hardship on the agency.*

Describe the effectiveness of the policies, procedures, or practices to implement the PAS requirement. Some examples of an effective program include timely processing requests for PAS, timely providing approved services, conducting training for managers and supervisors, and monitoring PAS requests for trends.

During FY 2021, the desk reference for RA/PAS served as an informative tool. PM #100 replaced the desk reference with materials located at <https://hcnet.doe.gov/documents/reasonable-accommodation-policy-memorandum-100>.

**Section VII: EEO Complaint and Findings Data**

**A. EEO COMPLAINT DATA INVOLVING HARASSMENT**

1. During the last fiscal year, did a higher percentage of PWD file a formal EEO complaint alleging harassment, as compared to the governmentwide average?

Answer No

2. During the last fiscal year, did any complaints alleging harassment based on disability status result in a finding of discrimination or a settlement agreement?

Answer No

3. If the agency had one or more findings of discrimination alleging harassment based on disability status during the last fiscal year, please describe the corrective measures taken by the agency.

N/A

**B. EEO COMPLAINT DATA INVOLVING REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION**

1. During the last fiscal year, did a higher percentage of PWD file a formal EEO complaint alleging failure to provide a reasonable accommodation, as compared to the government-wide average?

Answer No

2. During the last fiscal year, did any complaints alleging failure to provide reasonable accommodation result in a finding of discrimination or a settlement agreement?

Answer No

3. If the agency had one or more findings of discrimination involving the failure to provide a reasonable accommodation during the last fiscal year, please describe the corrective measures taken by the agency.

|     |
|-----|
| N/A |
|-----|

## Section VIII: Identification and Removal of Barriers

*Element D of MD-715 requires agencies to conduct a barrier analysis when a trigger suggests that a policy, procedure, or practice may be impeding the employment opportunities of a protected EEO group.*

1. Has the agency identified any barriers (policies, procedures, and/or practices) that affect employment opportunities for PWD and/or PWTD?

Answer Yes

2. Has the agency established a plan to correct the barrier(s) involving PWD and/or PWTD?

Answer Yes

3. Identify each trigger and plan to remove the barrier(s), including the identified barrier(s), objective(s), responsible official(s), planned activities, and, where applicable, accomplishments

|   |                    |  |                      |   |  |
|---|--------------------|--|----------------------|---|--|
| <b>Source of the Trigger:</b>   |                    | Other  |                      |   |  |
| <b>Specific Workforce Data Table:</b>   |                    | Workforce Data Table - B1  |                      |   |  |
| <b>STATEMENT OF CONDITION THAT WAS A TRIGGER FOR A POTENTIAL BARRIER:</b>   |                    | <p>(1) FEVS 2019 data analysis comparing responses of PWD and those without disabilities includes findings consistent with the research literature (see Bonaccio et al 2020 for a recent review) about issues for PWD related to career development. Specifically, PWD were less optimistic (37% positive, 38% negative) than those without disabilities (44% positive, 28% negative) about their opportunities for advancement at DOE. (See also Workforce Analysis Report: MD-715 Supporting Document)</p> <p>(2) Lower than expected rates of applications to career development programs: fellowships (PWD and PWTB); and mentoring, coaching, and other career development (PWTB).</p> <p>(3) Complaints data: in FY 2021, the number of formal EEO complaints declined from 41 in FY 2018 to 21 in FY 2021. However, complaints alleging a physical and/or mental disability basis represented 38.1% of the FY 2021 complaints, an increase of 16.1 percentage points from 22.0% in FY 2018.</p> |                      |   |  |
| Provide a brief narrative describing the condition at issue.  |                    |  |                      |   |  |
| How was the condition recognized as a potential barrier?  |                    |  |                      |   |  |
| <b>STATEMENT OF BARRIER GROUPS:</b>   |                    | <i>Barrier Group</i>   |                      |   |  |
|   |                    | People with Disabilities   |                      |   |  |
|   |                    | People with Targeted Disabilities  |                      |   |  |
| <b>Barrier Analysis Process Completed?:</b>   |                    | N  |                      |   |  |
| <b>Barrier(s) Identified?:</b>  |                    | N  |                      |   |  |
| <b>STATEMENT OF IDENTIFIED BARRIER:</b>   |                    | <b>Barrier Name</b>  |                      | <b>Description of Policy, Procedure, or Practice</b>  |  |
| Provide a succinct statement of the agency policy, procedure or practice that has been determined to be the barrier of the undesired condition. |                    | PWD/PWTB Promotions  |                      | As shown in the above analyses and those in the Workforce Analysis Report: MD-715 Supporting Document, PWD at DOE are less likely to apply for career development programs. PWD are more negative about their opportunities for advancement within DOE. |  |
| <b>Objective(s) and Dates for EEO Plan</b>  |                    |  |                      |   |  |
| <b>Date Initiated</b>   | <b>Target Date</b> | <b>Sufficient Funding / Staffing?</b>  | <b>Date Modified</b> | <b>Date Completed</b>   | <b>Objective Description</b>   |
| 07/31/2021  | 12/31/2022         | Yes  |                      |   | Complete Applicant Flow Analysis of newly-available USA Staffing data to support on-going identification of barriers. Use FEVS and other data sources at DOE to continue to address issues for PWD at DOE.   |
| 02/15/2021  | 03/31/2022         | Yes  |                      | 09/01/2021  | Conducted further barrier analysis in this area, including investigation of feasibility of establishing a disability-focused employee resource group (ERG). Research completed by Equal Employment Opportunity Assessment and Compliance Division (EEO-ACD, formerly the Equity and Diversity Division) and ERG planning and development still in progress. Additional activities in FY 2022 to be undertaken in alignment with the DOE Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Accessibility (DEIA) Strategic Plan. |

| Responsible Official(s)   |  |                                |               |                 |
|---|--|--------------------------------|---------------|-----------------|
| Title   | Name   | Standards Address The Plan?    |               |                 |
| Director, Employee Relations Division, Office of Policy, Labor and Employee Relations | Rita Hollins   | Yes                            |               |                 |
| EEO Specialist  | Bradley Shaff  | Yes                            |               |                 |
| Chief, Equity & Diversity   | Jaime Claudio  | Yes                            |               |                 |
| Acting Director, Office of Recruitment and Advisory Services                          | Carl A. Durrett II   | Yes                            |               |                 |
| Social Science Research Analyst   | Lisa Frehill   | Yes                            |               |                 |
| Planned Activities Toward Completion of Objective                                     |  |                                |               |                 |
| Target Date   | Planned Activities   | Sufficient Staffing & Funding? | Modified Date | Completion Date |
| 11/30/2021  | Investigate use of qualitative methodologies to better understand the low participation levels of PWD in fellowship programs and PWTD in mentoring, coaching, fellowship, and other career development programs.   | Yes                            | 12/30/2022    |                 |
| 10/30/2021  | Increase collaboration with an ad-hoc working group with HC to:<br>(a) discuss triggers related to PWD/PWTD in this area;<br>(b) Review/assess DOE's implementation of OPM's best practices for retention of PWD (see: <a href="https://www.opm.gov/policy-data-oversight/disability-employment/retention/">https://www.opm.gov/policy-data-oversight/disability-employment/retention/</a> ); and<br>(c) Review best practices identified by EEOC for individuals with disabilities. | Yes                            |               | 10/30/2021      |
| 03/15/2021  | Analyze DOE FEVS agency demographic report data associated with disability status. Identify extent to which assessments of items associated with engagement, the New IQ, and career development (in alignment with GAO 20-592) by respondents with disabilities differed from those of respondents without disabilities.   | Yes                            |               | 03/15/2021      |
| 03/31/2021  | Develop draft Agency-Specific Items (ASIs) for the 2021 FEVS to determine extent to which (a) DOE employees are aware of reasonable accommodations and other disability-related policies and procedures; and (b) DOE employees perceive the DOE workplace as welcoming and inclusive of PWD.   | Yes                            | 05/18/2021    | 05/18/2021      |
| 08/01/2022  | Complete a joint EEO-ACD/HC, Office of Policy, Labor and Employee Relations (OPLER), Employee Relations Division report of DOE's FEVS 2021 ASIs about issues for PWD at DOE.   | Yes                            |               |                 |
| 12/31/2022  | Continue to work with the disability awareness ERG formation team. Establish and support an appropriate ERG and integrate into the community of DOE ERGs.  | Yes                            |               |                 |
| 08/01/2022  | Provide a briefing to the disability awareness ERG formation team based on the joint EEO-ACD/HC OPLER report (FEVS ASI data, other FEVS indices, and DOE workforce data).  | Yes                            |               |                 |

| <b>Report of Accomplishments</b> |  |
|----------------------------------|--|
| <b>Fiscal Year</b>               | <b>Accomplishment</b>  |
| 2021                             | <p>(1) The Special Emphasis Program observance of National Disability Employment Awareness Month (NDEAM) was a training conducted in October 2021 by DOE's EEO-ACD Equal Employment Specialist.</p> <p>(2) EEO-ACD completed FEVS demographic analysis and a brief review of recent literature associated with the employee cycle and issues for persons with disabilities. These analyses were used in concert with appropriate social science survey methodologies to develop a set of proposed Agency Specific Items for the 2021 DOE FEVS to understand knowledge and awareness of disability-related policies and procedures, and the climate for persons with disabilities at DOE.</p> <p>DOE's analyses are included in the Workforce Analysis Report: MD-715 Supporting Document.</p> <p>(3) Via EEO-ACD's public presentations of workforce and FEVS data to Employee Resource Groups (ERG) in FY 2021, a group of individuals interested in forming an ERG to address issues related to PWD was identified, EEO-ACD staff provided organizational support, data support (e.g., sharing workforce data and FEVs similar to what was shared with other ERGs), and partnership in implementing the FY 2022 Special Emphasis Program Observance of Disability Awareness Month in October 2021.</p> |

| <b>Report of Accomplishments</b> |   |
|----------------------------------|---|
| <b>Fiscal Year</b>               | <b>Accomplishment</b>   |
| 2022                             | <p>(1) Analyses of the FY 2021 FEVS Agency Specific Items (ASIs) related to disability topics were incorporated into the FY 2021 MD-715 along with other key FEVS findings. These analyses documented a persistent gap between PWD versus the overall DOE workforce including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Lower levels of job satisfaction (especially satisfaction with recognition for doing a good job and pay);</li> <li>(b) Lower levels of employee engagement (EEI) overall and on the three sub-factors that constitute the EEI (Leaders lead, Supervisors, and Intrinsic work experience);</li> <li>(c) Less positive views about their perceptions of opportunity to get a better job at DOE.</li> <li>(d) Less agreement with the FEVS item: "I can disclose a suspected violation of any law, rule or regulation without fear of reprisal."</li> <li>(e) Less agreement with the statement: "My supervisor is committed to a workforce representative of all segments of society."</li> </ul> <p>In all of these cases, PWD were less likely to agree by at least three percentage points than DOE employees overall.</p> <p>(2) On the ASIs, DOE learned that there was still more work to do to ensure all employees know how to request a reasonable accommodation (RA) and how to report a suspected instance of discrimination against a PWD. DOE also learned that 7% of employees* had witnessed or experienced disability-based discrimination and 8% reported they did not know if they had witnessed or experienced disability-based discrimination. These findings and those described under item 1 were included in the Workforce Analysis Report: MD-715 Supporting Document and will be included in a joint report (currently in preparation) by EEO-ACD / HC-OPLER. With the implementation of the new Policy Memorandum (PM) #100, which included a robust set of resources for PWD to make RA/PAS requests, there were many training sessions that targeted supervisors and managers; DOE is planning training for the entire workforce.</p> <p>(3) DOE will retain the FY 2021 ASIs in the FY 2022 FEVS administration. Additionally, DOE shared FEVS findings described here with DOE's lead on the Department's DEIA Strategic Plan. Five other ASIs were added to the DOE FY 2022 FEVS to learn about employee experiences associated with harassment and retaliation.</p> <p>(4) EEO-ACD organized a National Disability Employment Awareness Month (NDEAM) observance held virtually on October 26, 2021. The theme this year was "America's Recovery: Powered by Inclusion." The purpose of NDEAM is to acknowledge and celebrate the ongoing contributions and achievements of employees with disabilities. On a broader scale, NDEAM also serves to dispel harmful myths and stereotypes that are sometimes associated with PWD. This event focused on mental health issues in the workplace, and specifically, the impact of Covid-19 on mental health of employees everywhere. The keynote address was provided by Mr. Chris Bouneff, the Executive Director of the Oregon Office of the National Alliance of Mental Illness (NAMI). Ms. Rita Hollins, Director Employee Relations Division, OPLER informed the audience about the basics of how to request an RA/PAS, where to find the name and contact information for the LRAC for each DOE Element, and where to find additional resources, such as DOE/HC PM #100A which details the RA/PAS request process, and types of RA/PAS that may be available for PWD at the Department.</p> <p>&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;<br/>                     *With a 65% response rate and a census rather than a sample survey, FEVS results are statistically generalizable to the population of DOE employees.</p> |

4. Please explain the factor(s) that prevented the agency from timely completing any of the planned activities.

In FY 2021 some planned activities were delayed with a reallocation of human resources (D&I Specialist and Social Science Research Specialist) to support the Department-wide DEIA Assessment (in alignment with EO 14035) and then the development of DOE's DEIA Strategic Plan. This work was in alignment with the intent of the planned activities to remove barriers to PWD and PWTD advancement at DOE. On-going collaboration of EEO-ACD with HC and the DEIA Office, including any related working groups, will discuss data, potential barriers, and methods to address them.

5. For the planned activities that were completed, please describe the actual impact of those activities toward eliminating the

barrier(s).

1. DOE had an FY 2021 permanent Federal workforce of 6,611, of whom 937 were PWD (14.2%) and 187 were PWTD (2.8%), both of which exceed the EEOC 501 goals (which were 12% for PWD and 2% for PWTD). The 69 PWD Schedule A employees represented 1.0% of DOE's workforce in FY 2021 and 23.2% of all Schedule A employees.

2. In FY 2021, the EEOC 501 goals were approved by the Chief Human Capital Officer and tracked quarterly. Additional hiring goals were: 2% for Schedule A hires, 11% for veterans with disabilities, and 7% for veterans with disabilities of 30% or more. Hires of individuals with disabilities met or exceeded the targeted goals in most areas. In FY 2021, PWD represented 13.5% of new hires, while PWTD represented 1.9%, Schedule A hires 2.6%, veterans with disabilities 14.4%, and veterans with disabilities of 30% or more accounted for 12.9% of new hires in FY 2021.

Progress was assessed through quarterly reviews against the hiring goals and shared with HR Business Partners to inform hiring and recruitment consultations with their customers. Some Program Offices have established their own oversight process and metrics to further monitor activities within their areas of responsibility. Lists of upcoming recruiting events and sources are also offered to help them target a diverse recruitment strategy.

6. If the planned activities did not correct the trigger(s) and/or barrier(s), please describe how the agency intends to improve the plan for the next fiscal year.

For FY 2022, DOE is in the process of hiring ~1,000 new employees for the "Clean Energy Corps". The DEIA Deputy Director in the Office of Economic Impact and Diversity is spearheading working groups that are examining recruitment and hiring processes, including developing training for hiring managers and the interviewers who will be involved with this large personnel surge. The trainings will include unconscious bias training, which includes segments on PWD and PWTD, for officials with hiring responsibilities. Additionally EEO-ACD is supporting this effort using the MD-715 workforce data, the newly-released EEOC/Census Bureau 2014-2018 American Community Survey data tool, and FedScope data to provide contextual information about representation of PWD and PWTD (among other demographic categories) in the DOE workforce in many of DOE's largest occupational series. Additional barrier analyses are planned that will focus on low participation levels of PWD and PWTD, especially in key occupations in which PWD were below the 12% benchmark (e.g., 0340 Program Management, 0801 General Engineering, and 0905 General Attorney).